

The Hong Kong Daily Press.

No. 4219

九百一十九年

五月七日

年未辛酉

HONGKONG, TUESDAY, 16TH MAY, 1871.

六月十五日

香港

PRICE \$2 PER MONTH

Arrivals.

May 15, CLAN ALPINE, British str. 845, Beckett, Yokohama 5th May, General JARINNE, MATHISON & CO. May 15, GODAVARY, Fran. str. 907, Foochee, Yokohama May 9th, General — MARS AURIS MARITIME. May 16, CHUKEIANG, Brit. str. 636, Hogg, Shanghai 12th May, General — SIMSON & CO.

Departures.

May 15, INSULINE, for Saigon. May 15, MOSS GLEN, for Melbourne. May 15, ELVIRA, for Bangkok. May 15, DAYLIGHT, for Bangkok. May 15, MOONLIGHT, for Bangkok. May 15, BUNGLAY, for Saigon. May 15, GLENLYON, for Saigon. May 15, HATFLY, for Saigon. May 15, W.M. MILLER, str. for Saigon and Singapore.

Clearances.

AT THE HARBOUR MASTER'S OFFICE, 15TH MAY.
Francois Felix, for Saigon.
Benefactor, for Saigon.

PASSENGERS.

For Clan Alpine, str. from Yokohama—Mr. Edward...
Messrs. Smith and Denton—
For Chukking, str. from Shanghai—
Messrs. Elliott, Daniel and 127 Chinese.

Reports.

The British steamship Clan Alpine reports left Yokohama on the 5th May, bad strong breeze to the Leeuwarden; from thence light Southerly winds and fine weather. Arrived at Hongkong on 15th.

The British ship Delti reports first part steady N.E. weather, later part sick between S.E. and S.W.

The French steamship Godavary, from Yokohama on 9th May, reports much rain and light S.E. winds.

The French bark Elvira reports left Cape St. James on May 1st, until the 5th fresh East by wind, with passing showers and much lightning; since then variable light winds between S.E. and S.W.

The British bark Fugie Queen reports very unsteady weather, with strong winds and heavy rain, all the passes closed. On May 15th, passed S.S. Simeone. On the 16th, at 2 a.m., passed steamship Foster, bound North. On the 15th, at 9 a.m., passed British barque Mary Edie, bound North.

The British steamship Chukking reports every unsteady weather, with strong winds and heavy rain, all the passes closed. On May 15th, passed S.S. Simeone. On the 16th, at 2 a.m., passed steamship Foster, bound North. On the 15th, at 9 a.m., passed British barque Mary Edie, bound North.

Auction Sales To-day.

Note

THE RENDITION CASE.

COPIES OF CHIEF-JUSTICE SMALLEY'S EVIDENCE IN THE MATTER OF KWOK-SING can be obtained at the Office of this Paper.

Price... 35 cents each.

Hongkong, 5th April, 1871.

L. OST, on Thursday Evening's ETING, containing two diamonds and a ruby between them. A suitable reward will be given to whoever can furnish information as to its whereabouts. Address A. M. J. Dally Press Office, 1688, Hongkong, 15th May, 1871.

NOTIFICATION.

Banks.

HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION. SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL \$3,000,000 DOLLARS.

Court of Directors.—Chairman—T. P. BOWEN. Deputy Chairman—T. P. BOWEN. Esq. Mr. E. B. BELLOWS, Esq. Mr. LEONARD, Esq. Mr. GEORGE J. HALLAND, Esq. Mr. J. REED, Esq. Mr. TURNER, Esq.

Managers.—Hongkong—James GREG, Esq. Acting Chief Manager—Shanghai—David McLean, Esq. London—Barber, London and County Bank.

HONGKONG.—INTEREST ALLOWED.

On Current Deposit Accounts at the rate of 1 per cent. per month on the daily balance.

On Fixed Deposits.

For 3 months' 3 per cent. per annum.

12 5 LOCAL BILLS DISCOUNTED.

On Standard Approved Securities and every description of Banking and Exchange claims transferred.

Drafts—granted on London, and the chief commercial places in Europe, India, Australia, America, China and Japan.

JOHN TURNER, Chief Manager of the Corporation.

No. 1, Queen's Road East.

Hongkong, 3rd January, 1871.

CHINA TRADERS' INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED.

A DIVIDEND of 10% (fifteen and a half per cent.) has been declared on the net premium contributed by Shareholders to the above Company for the year ended October 31st, 1870.

Warrants may be had on application at the office of the Company, No. 48, Queen's Road.

By order of the Board,

AUGUSTINE HEARD & CO., General Agents.

23, 356, Hongkong, 1st April, 1871.

UNION INSURANCE SOCIETY OF CANTON.

HEAD OFFICE—HONGKONG.

General Agents—M. DEUTSCH & CO.

Agents—M. G. DEUTSCH & CO.

O. F. GREGG & CO.

M. G. DEUTSCH & CO.

W. H. DEUTSCH & CO.

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Esq.

HERMAN MILLER, Esq.

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Esq.

J. M. ARMSTRONG.

W. H. DEUTSCH & CO.

NOW READY.

BOUNDED VOLUMES of the TRADE REPORT for the year 1870. Price \$10.
Apply at the Daily Press Office:
Hongkong, 1st February, 1871.

The delivery of the Daily Press from this office commenced Monday morning at 10.10, and the last messenger left the office at 10.30.

The Daily Press

Hongkong, May 16th, 1871.

The objection made by Judge Ball to the alterations in the Summary Court Ordinance as it was originally proposed, ought scarcely to be passed without comment. Although the matter practically involves itself into a personal question, it involves points of general interest, because likely to recur in any future reform of the same kind. The main objection taken by the Judge of the Summary Court to the Ordinance as originally framed, was that while it threw additional work upon him, it did not make any provision for an increase in his salary. Upon this, he wrote a letter of protest to the Colonial Secretary, and at the same time framed a draft which in his opinion was the most desirable for the Court. In consequence of this, the first draft made by the Attorney-General was altered in such a way as to withdraw a portion, though not all, of the additional work which it was proposed should be laid upon the Court; and Judge Ball, after stating from his place in the Legislative Council the nature of his objections, contented himself with requesting that the documents in connection with it should be sent to the Colonial Office, and did not raise any further opposition to the Ordinance as framed by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Without advocating that officials performing important duties should be underpaid, it may be considered that the sum of £1,500 per annum, which is the present salary of the Judge of the Summary Court, is a fair amount of remuneration for something more than cases of the kind which, at all events for the last two or three years, have formed the staple of the matters brought before that tribunal. The number of cases over a hundred dollars which come forward is extremely limited the bulk of the work, as the reports published from time to time show, consisting of trifling suits for five, ten, or twenty dollars, and being hardly in any way more important than the average run of County Court cases at home. It can be hardly, therefore, be held that, with a pension to follow on retirement, the amount paid to the Judge of the Summary Court is not such that, if necessary, something more than the work which has hitherto been performed in that Court should be expected from him. The Judge of the Summary Court, however, seemed to be under an impression that on principle it was right that an increase of salary should be a matter of course follow an increase of work. We cannot help thinking that, in enunciating this view, he was unconsciously giving utterance to a principle of action which has too frequently been followed in Hongkong, and which is now very generally recognized as an abuse in the administration. The moment the duties of any individual become of the slightest importance, the idea is to increase the standing of his office, and to raise his salary, although as has often been the case he has been overpaid and underworked before. Instances where this has been done are too familiar to the public to need re-stating. It is absurd that Government servants should be so much more sensitive on this point than other people. Men employed in general offices are usually content to adopt a liberal view in such matters, and, so long as their work is not pressing and their remuneration fair for what work is done, to abstain from expecting their salaries to go precisely part pace with their duties; and it would be antisocial to see a little more of this spirit manifested by those in Government employ. This was clearly pointed out by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, who noticed the inconvenience which would arise at home if, whenever a law bill was passed in Parliament, the Judges commenced asking for increases in their salaries.

The manner and the time in which the application was made were also somewhat ill-chosen. If there were grounds for asking for an increase, this might have been done with more fitness after the Ordinance had been passed, and the additional work which was anticipated had become an actual fact. To mix the question of the Judge's salary up with the passing of the Ordinance constituting the Court, was at the very least, a little unseemly; and it might also be objected that this incongruousness was increased by the fact that the Judge of the Summary Court sat in the Legislative Council as a non-official member. As such, he might be reasonably expected to look to the opinions of his colleagues upon any question of finance, and being an official, to be rather the more than the less disposed to yield to it. As Judge, his view on the question of salary might naturally differ from that which he would entertain on the subject strictly in his capacity of member of the Council; and it was important to bear the distinction in mind.

Had the master been left to the ordinary course of business, that is to say, the Ordinance as at first drafted by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, passed with such modifications as were desired on its merits, the question of salary would, when it came forward at a future date, have been of a very simple nature. All that would be requisite would be to ascertain whether the amount paid was or was not a fair remuneration for the work done. There has very seldom been any illiberality shown in this respect, in Hongkong, and there was no reason to suppose such would be the case in the present instance. As the matter actually stands, we presume this will be the mode that will be adopted for the settlement of the question. If the Home Government prefer that Judge Ball's draft be adopted, instead of the Ordinance just passed, and if this entail extra work upon the Court, it will then be a question whether the remuneration existing is sufficient. The principle that an increase of work must necessarily be accompanied by an increase of salary is inadmissible, because it ignores the fact that it is possible a salary at a given moment may be higher than the duties of the particular official to whom it is paid really call for. While the public in Hongkong will no doubt be glad to see this question settled upon the most liberal

basis, it cannot be imagined they will be willing to see the Estimates swelled with an additional permanent charge, if it prove after all that even the extra duties made is not demanded of the Judge of the Summary Court than is properly remunerated with the salary at present paid.

Complaints are frequently made with regard to the notice which the service of notices, from the Government, in reference to trials for amounts for Police and Lighting Taxes, which are uncharged. These sums are now collected in advance upon empty as well as tenanted houses, and in consequence, if an overcharge is made, the money is irrecoverably lost, should the Landlord or Agent fail to appear within ten days after the expiration of each quarter. Although notice is given in the *Notice of the time* the Taxes are due, nothing is said as to the period allowed for appeal; and it is very reasonably felt that this should be done, not only in the *Gazette*, but also in the local papers—seeing that non-compliance with the rule may have serious legal consequences.

The Chief Justice.—Unquestionably I refuse.

The Chief Justice.—There is no other motion before me.

The Attorney-General.—Does your Lordship wish to hear my motion first?

The Chief Justice.—I do, on the ground that you have given no notice.

The Attorney-General said he had given notice to the other side and to the Judge's clerk.

The Chief Justice.—What is the Attorney-General's usually his procedure?

The Chief Justice.—There is no other motion before me.

The Attorney-General.—In what I have written?

The Chief Justice.—That the notice was issued after close of office.

The Chief Justice.—I have not said any notice.

The Attorney-General.—No; but, when I am interested in the facts, and your Lordship writes down solemnly, and in public facts which the records of the Court will prove to be true.

The Chief Justice.—What is there erroneous in what I have written?

The Attorney-General.—That the notice was issued after close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?

The Attorney-General.—On the close of office.

The Chief Justice.—What is the piece of paper you have given me?

The Attorney-General.—The Clerk has omitted to put Mr. Alexander's name upon it. That object might be taken by counsel on the other side.

The Chief Justice.—And Mr. Sharp set out to do what I have written down?</

MISCELLANEOUS.

By Mr. C. L. Smith, who like most people has a great deal to say about the war.

Why is a potato that's not meat like Dr. Jenner?—Because it's a wary-naturer.

AWFUL EFFECTS OF THE WAR ON THE PRICE OF FOOD.—Blowers have risen.

A FACT THAT NO ONE KNEW.—That Germany is the birthplace of Kant.

A wing says, "In Germany, when a paper says anything, why, they kill the editor."

Strangely enough, not one editor has been killed there for two hundred years.

The Paris correspondent of *Walter's* reports that the death of M. de Gaulle, the celebrated election, he died in Normandy during the siege of Paris.

Letters from home announce that, in official circles, it is said and generally believed that, soon as Sir Harry Parkes arrives in England, he will be appointed Ambassador to Japan. Parkes, and that Mr. Ward will succeed him as Minister in Japan.—*Conqueror.*

A gentleman is beginning to write out a bond, saying thus, "Know one woman by these presents, I have an excellent idea how she should be known to men by these presents."—"Very well," said the gentleman, "if one woman knows it, all men will be sure to know it."

COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

MAY 15TH, EVENING.

A strong speculative feeling has been kept up throughout the day for ready cargo on time, the 21st inst., as no ship of the S.S. to arrive, on three weeks' time, owing to a rumour of a small supply coming forward next month, as also of a further advance in Calcutta in the value of Patna, which would bring the value of the present likewise a fair native demand. Patna at \$570 to \$575; Biensar at \$457 to \$550 on credit terms; on time, sales have been effected at \$567, closing at \$573; and that of the 5th sale at \$575 to \$580, closing first at the last sale, with few if any sellers. No change in Mysore.

MAY 16TH, MORNING.

Patna \$570 to \$575; Biensar \$547 to \$550; large buyers are firm at these rates. Patna, 5th sales to arrive, \$582. On cash terms, but little is doing at present, the tendency of the market, however, appears to be upwards.

SURVEY.

Hongkong Bank Shares, Old—36 per cent. premium.

Hongkong Bank Shares, New—304 per cent. premium.

Union Insurance Society of Canton, new shares \$2,500 per share premium.

China Traders' Insurance Company's Shares—\$2,500 per share premium.

China and Japan Marine Insurance Co.'s 50 per cent. share premium.

Chinese Insurance Company—\$55 per share.

Hongkong Fire Insurance Company's Shares—\$275 per share premium.

China Fire Insurance Company's Shares—\$33.

Victoria Fire Insurance Company's Shares—\$42 per cent. share premium.

Hongkong and Whampoa Dock Company's Shares—35 cent discount.

Hongkong, Canton, and Macao Steamboat Co.'s Shares—\$90 to 40 cent. prem.

Shanghai Steam Navigation Company's Shares—25 cent. share premium.

China Sea-going and Straits Steamship Company—par.

China and Straits Steam Navigation Co.—par.

Hongkong Gas Company's Shares—\$60 per share.

Hongkong Hotel Company's Shares—60 per cent. discount.

Hongkong Distillery Company—10 per cent. premium, nominal.

Indo-Chinese Sugar Company—5 per cent. discount.

EXCHANGE.

ON LONDON.—Bank Bills, at 3 months' sight, —

Bank Bills, at 6 months' sight, 4/1.

One Month Bills, at 3 months' sight, 4/1.

Documentary Bills, at 3 months' sight, 4/1.

Bank Bills on demand, 4/1.

ON NEW YORK.—Private, 5 months' sight, —

One Month Bills, at 3 months' sight, 2/2.

ON CALCUTTA.—Bank, 6 days sight, 2/2.

Bank, 3 days' sight, 7/2.

Bank, 15 days' sight, 7/2.

Private, 30 days' sight, 7/2.

SALES OF MAY 15TH, 1871.

As reported by *Chinaman*.

Saigon Rice, 2,000 piculs, at \$245, by Hung-fung to travelling merchant.

White Sugar, 50 piculs, at \$640, by Hung-fung to Hongkong merchant.

White Wax, 2 pieces at \$100.00, by How-to-Wax to a Chinese merchant.

White Wax, 3 pieces, at \$104.00, by Wing-shing-shun to Hongkong merchant.

Caleutta Cotton, 90 bales, at \$13.50, by Farves merchant to Hop-hing.

Caleutta Cotton, 100 bales, at \$13.60, by Farves merchant to Hop-hing.

White Beans, 1,600 piculs, at \$2.02, by Yuen-tai to Canton merchant.

White Beans, 3,000 piculs, at \$1.88, by Yuen-tai to Canton merchant.

Bombay Cotton, 100 bales, at \$16.25, by Farves merchant to Canton merchant.

Caleutta Cotton, 200 bales, at \$15.00, by Farves merchant to Canton merchant.

Caleutta Cotton, 100 bales, at \$14.75, by Farves merchant to Yuen-wu-woong.

Intimations.

NOTICE.

STATE OF T. G. DONALDSON, Deceased.

ALL persons indebted to, or having claims against the above Estate, are requested to communicate with:

RICH. F. HENKE,

1, Theobald's Buildings, Strand, London, 24th December, 1870.

A. MILLAR & CO.,

HOUSE SHIP AND STEAMBOAT PLUMBERS,

COPPERERS AND BRASSFOUNDERS,

No. 1, Queen's Buildings, Strand, London, Opposite H.M. Naval Dock-Yard.

Opposite H.M. Naval Dock-Yard, March, 1871.

THE PENTAL HOTEL,

BOWLING ALLEY, AND

BILLIARD ROOMS,

WELLINGTON STREET, HONGKONG,

AND THE PUBLIC,

NOW OPENED,

Under new Management.

Molars of all hours.

Wines and Spirits of the best quality only.

A Good Reading Room.

Board and Lodging of Moderate Rates.

J. RAYNES,

Proprietor of 598 Hongkong, 8th April, 1871.

COSMOPOLITAN FAMILY HOTEL,

Corner of Elgin and Shand Streets,

HONGKONG.

(LATE CLUB LUSTHANO.)

RESTAURANT,

PRIVATE DINING ROOMS,

AND BILLIARD ROOMS,

WELLINGTON STREET, HONGKONG,

AND THE PUBLIC,

NOW OPENED,

Under new Management.

Molars of all hours.

Wines and Spirits of the best quality only.

A Good Reading Room.

Board and Lodging of Moderate Rates.

J. RAYNES,

Proprietor of 598 Hongkong, 8th April, 1871.

WILLIAM E. HOLMES,

MR.—CHAIRED FROM ANY PART OF THE CITY TO THE COSMOPOLITAN HOTEL, TEN CENTS.

ST. 31, WALTER'S HOTEL,

Extracts.

Handsome Knives.
(Saturday Review)

that she covets? Her man in the moon "purchases unlimited credit at her disposal." The "man in the moon" is equal to the occasion, and the dark figures of the queen of milliners are set in motion to gratify her wife. It is even rumoured that for the rest of the fashionable season, in which she is to be seen, the world will be a school to the same mysterious and benevolent anxiety: "That she has solved the difficult problem of living at the rate of ten thousand a year on an income of one, without larding her husband in bankruptcy, or even causing him to be suspected of it." But the result of a grandmother's code of propriety may exceed that on this—that no young lady or man could accept a gift of a loan of money from a male person other than her husband, unless he were very relative, without prejudice to his wife's honour. Once more, Lovelace has married a lovely vicar for his own, he has always a stock device for compromising her honour. By a train of seeming accident she is maneuvered into having recourse to his purse. With the aid of a treacherous abigail, he succeeds in getting his hands on a small supply of money, and does himself in a military uniform, exposed to the mockery of an unselect audience. She is particularly isolated from her chaperon in the crowd of Marchioness, and left to the wiles of her tempter. But the result of a party is to prove with what a shattering crash. At the critical moment, when the trembling beauty is about to fall into his arms, he goes to a fainting fit, Lovelace, with a well-hammed air of unconcern, to "excuse" her from her chaperon. With a smile, and a look of respect, her fears, contents him to honour him by accepting a temporary loan from his purse. Thereupon a Heavenly blush overcomes the cheeks of the exalted Clarissa. Her exquisite modesty takes the upper hand, and she declines the loan. Lovelace, however, is not to be put off so easily, and, after a momentary obligation, leaves, trivial, to naughty Mr. Lovelace. Of what construction may not the incident be susceptible? How explain it to the satisfaction of a suspicious parent or jealous husband? How justify its conduct to the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world?

Even more astonishing to our grandfathers, with their stricter notions of honour and punctilio, would be the sleek cynicism displayed by the partisans and neophytes of those fair days. Lovelace is a living example of a party who, to prove with what a shattering crash.

At the critical moment, when the trembling beauty is about to fall into his arms, he goes to a fainting fit, Lovelace, with a well-hammed air of unconcern, to "excuse" her from her chaperon. With a smile, and a look of respect, her fears, contents him to honour him by accepting a temporary loan from his purse. Thereupon a Heavenly blush overcomes the cheeks of the exalted Clarissa. Her exquisite modesty takes the upper hand, and she declines the loan. Lovelace, however, is not to be put off so easily, and, after a momentary obligation, leaves, trivial, to naughty Mr. Lovelace. Of what construction may not the incident be susceptible? How explain it to the satisfaction of a suspicious parent or jealous husband? How justify its conduct to the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world? How sustain it in the eyes of the world?

Yet a husband who offers himself that his wife may play the foolish and ungrateful girl, and who, in his impetuosity, has caused his wife to be exposed to the world, will be the object of general contempt, and the term of the situation prevails.

With the prospect of a gain in interest, or worse still, of abandonment to the vagabonds of the night, what can the desolute beauty do but consent to an hysterical acceptance of the offer? And this is the secret of his wife's behaviour, and the ingenuous young gentleman retires to boast of his evil companionship.

Noticing this, the husband, who is not devoid of a sense of humour, asks his wife, "What is the name of your new friend?"

From this it is evident that, according to the etiquette of the last century, no young lady, married or spinster, could accept a gift or a loan from a male friend without running the risk of tarnishing her reputation. This may have been the case in the days of our grandfathers, but it is not so now. Many persons who would not be sorry to have it reaffirmed at the present day.

A combination of luxury and lewdness has exploded the scruples of the Evelines and Harpies, and the old-world notion of a woman being squeamish, women have become bold. If she is pretty and popular, she may enjoy a sort of perpetual *jouir de son*. No small portion of her pin-money comes out of the pockets of her admirers. The *bouquet, bonbons, and chocolates* which she consumes, and the *frivolously anonymous donations* are substantial evidence of the potency of her charms. These are trifles, but they serve to show how obsolete are the prim Richardsonian standards of feminine propriety. It has been reserved for some Harpies to organize on a much more extensive scale a system of rations on their male friends. The Handsome Harry is the *Urbain de la ville*, and the *Urbain de la campagne*. Yet his wife, who is as pitiful as his *exactions* as her *reverence*, is a Prussian analogue. Her *bonbons* are *bonbons*, but her *lewdly adored* *she-hood*, not *hood*, *foul*, *cigars*, *but* *bread*, *dishes*, *and diamonds*. She cannot afford to rights of *sex* for her *rapacity*, for her victim is her own family friend, but at least she can play the rôle of the *Urbain de la campagne* and please the imitators. For some time the Harpies within the Pale have envied the good fortune of the gilded outside. They have seen, with growing discontent, a variety of good things falling into the hands of their rivals, and have fretted at the perplexities of their own *prudentia*.

Why should *Adelaide* be excluded as a *handsome* part of the modern Dame, and they, by a stupid *adulta* from a state in the golden shower? Yet their impudence has culminated in a bold revelation of their *sex* by *adulta* to *adulta*. They have proclaimed the natural right of a fascinating woman to live by her *charms*.

The result is that a new and formidable danger has begun to be added to the many which environ our gilded outside. When the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* are *detached* to *motley*, it is a prison; personal violence to any officer or servant of the prison, or to a fellow-prisoner, or threats of such violence, grossly offensive or abusive language, or threats of death, or threats of serious bodily or wantonly breaking the prison windows, or otherwise destroying prison property when under punishment in a dark, refractory, or ordinary cell; wilfully making a disturbance to interrupt the order and discipline of the prison, and the *insolent* offering of gross insolence or *insubordination* requiring to be suppressed by extraordinary means. Before the corporal punishment is inflicted, there is an inquiry upon oath before the visiting director, and in the presence of the prisoner, before whom the *insolent* does not dare to stand, before a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporal punishment, under any circumstances, is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

Corporate punishment is a terrible power to place in the hands of prison officials, and if we decline to accept the *Urbain de la ville* and the *Urbain de la campagne* as *adulta*, we surely ought to hesitate before allowing a soldier to receive thirty-six lashes for breaking a pane of glass in a prison window.

</div